



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,297	01/08/2004	Steven M. Miller	RSW920030284US1	7583
51016 7590 05/12/2008 IBM CORP. (RALEIGH SOFTWARE GROUP) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201				
EXAMINER				
WONG, WILLIAM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/753,297

**Applicant(s)**

MILLER ET AL.

**Examiner**

WILLIAM WONG

**Art Unit**

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the communication filed on 02/13/2008.

- Claims 12, 21, 33, 42-43 have been amended.

Claims 1-56 are pending and have been examined. Previous objections and rejections not included in this office action have been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-26, 29-43, and 46-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1) in view of Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000, herein referred to as "Microsoft", see appendix section below for more details).

Claim 1

As per claim 1, Fullerton teaches a method (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") **for deploying an intelligent agenda program on a computer, the method comprising the steps of: installing the intelligent agenda program on the computer** (e.g. in paragraph 14 on page 2, "a computer program product for use with a computer system having a display and capable of generating a presentation from a stream of data, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having program code embodied therein comprising: (a) program code for accessing the stream of data; (b) program code for extracting content data from the stream of data; (c) program code for presenting the content data on the display; (d) program code for extracting outline data representing a plurality of data segments within the presentation, the data segments linked to respective segments of the presentation"); **wherein the intelligent agenda program displays an outline of a plurality of slides created by a presentation program** (e.g. in paragraph 14 on page 2, "... and (e) program code for presenting the outline data on the display simultaneously with the presentation of the content data" and figure 6); and **wherein the outline displays a contextual location of a current slide in a presentation** (e.g. in paragraph 185 on page 9, "The Outline

Art Unit: 2178

Window 238 also provides progress feedback and context information to the user by highlighting the current outline segment and may be visible by default. Alternatively, a visual icon 239 may be utilized to indicate the current segment" and figure 6). Fullerton further teaches that the outline can be hidden or displayed and moved around on the screen (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8), but does not specifically teach displaying the outline **in a corner on each of the plurality of slides, separating the outline from the remainder of each of the plurality of slides by a user configurable line, and wherein the intelligent agenda program automatically creates the outline from a title of each of the slides in the presentation.**

However, Dieberger teaches displaying an outline in a corner on the slides (e.g. in figure 1, outline is shown in the upper left corner, and paragraphs 20-21 and 36) and separating the outline from the remainder of the slides by a line (e.g. in figure 1, border). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the display method of the outline of Dieberger because it would provide more viewing space for the presentation content, and easily display the contextual information in a non-intrusive manner (e.g. in paragraph 21 and 25 of page 2).

It was also well known in the art to configure lines/border of elements displayed in a slide show presentation, as shown by Microsoft (e.g. in figures 5-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the outline of Fullerton to also include the formatting of

Microsoft for the purpose of providing the presentation creator the ability to modify the appearance of the outline.

Fullerton discloses simultaneous display of the presentation and outline (e.g. in paragraph 9, “windows for simultaneous display of a presentation, an abstract outline of the presentation and linking data to other relevant resources. The presentation content, outline and linking data are linked to allow for more efficient navigation and interaction with the presentation” and in figure 6). Therefore, it would have also been obvious to apply the modifications of Dieberger and Microsoft to each of the slides of Fullerton for the purpose of preserving the consistent contextual information provided by the outline to viewers of the presentation.

Furthermore, Yacovone teaches automatically creating the outline from the title of each of the slides in the presentation (e.g. in paragraph 41 on page 4, “Upon receiving the uploaded content, i.e., presentation slides 38 in this example ... The host system extracts the title of each slide (if PowerPoint®) and stores each slide title in the database for use later during playback by the viewer in the form of an active table-of-contents” and figure 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fullerton to include the outline creation method of Yacovone for the purpose of automating the generation of the outline data.

Claim 2

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the intelligent agenda program allows a user to re-organize the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 320-321, "Data in a Discourse file is interleaved in a way that facilitates later modification and editing without the need to reference original source media. This means that an on-site administrator can copy and paste content between different Discourse files to add or remove portions, or construct a customized lesson from smaller pieces... Discourse [file] further includes annotation of media with outline entries, transcripts, hyperlinks, and even selectable areas and command scripts").

Claim 3

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **accepting a user configured format of the outline, and displaying the outline on the slides in the user configured format** (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8, "The Discourse player 225 and user interface 230 presents several windows to the user. Each of these windows can be hidden or displayed, enabled or disabled, and moved around the screen at the discretion of either the user or the presentation creator" and in paragraph 205

Art Unit: 2178

on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarchy then the sum of the times of its children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window...").

#### Claim 4

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **determining whether a user has configured a display option, and responsive to the determination that the user has not configured the display option, displaying the outline with all of the topics in the outline expanded** (e.g. in figure 6 in view of paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchies will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state"; users can expand or collapse parts of the outline, but by default all the topics are expanded).

#### Claim 5

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has selected an outline expansion option, and responsive to the determination that the user has**



Art Unit: 2178

**selected the outline expansion option, displaying the outline according to the outline expansion option selected by the user** (e.g. in paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchys will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state").

#### Claim 8

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach expanding **only the current topic**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include expanding only the current topic in order to prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information and therefore provide a better contextual understanding of the material being presented.

#### Claim 9

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has limited the number of displayed lines on the outline; and responsive to the determination that the**

Art Unit: 2178

**user has limited the number of lines on the outline, modifying the outline to the number of displayed lines limited by the user** (e.g. in paragraph 188 on page 9, "The user interface of the Discourse player may be designed to obey the standard user interface guidelines of the native operating systems 250. Unlike other multimedia player environments which take over the entire screen, blocking out other applications, a Discourse presentation uses standard windowing routines that co-exist with other applications" and in paragraph 192 on page 9, "Main movie window 232 may be resizable by the user with the normal resizing controls..."; windows can be resized by the user, which would inherently determine the number of lines shown in the outline).

#### Claim 10

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the immediately adjacent topics are displayed in any remaining lines** (e.g. in figure 6).

#### Claim 11

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the topics above the current topic and the immediately adjacent topics are displayed, subject to the user limited number of lines** (e.g. in figure 6).

Claim 12

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has limited the type of displayed topics on the outline, and responsive to the determination that the user has limited the type of topics on the outline, modifying the outline to the type of displayed topics limited by the user** (e.g. in paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchys will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state"; the user is able to limit the type of topics displayed on the outline by collapsing portions of the outline).

Claim 13

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 12, but does not specifically teach **not displaying previous topics**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include not displaying previous topics in order to focus the viewer's attention to the topics left

Art Unit: 2178

to cover in the presentation and prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information.

#### Claim 14

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 12, but does not specifically teach **not displaying subsequent topics**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include not displaying previous topics in order to focus the user's attention to topics that have been and are currently being covered in the presentation and prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information.

#### Claim 15

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 3, but does not specifically teach **wherein the user configured format is a color and a line**. However, it was well known in the art to configure colors and lines of elements displayed in a slide show presentation, as shown by Microsoft (in figures 8-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the outline of

Art Unit: 2178

Fullerton to include the formatting of Microsoft for the purpose of providing the user increased control in the appearance of the presentation.

#### Claim 16

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format is a size of the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarch then the sum of the times of it children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window...").

#### Claim 17

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format is a layout of the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8, "The Discourse player 225 and user interface 230 presents several windows to the user. Each of these windows can be hidden or displayed, enabled or disabled, and moved around the screen at the discretion of either the user or the presentation creator").

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 18

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format pertains to a picture associated with the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 185 on page 9, "The Outline Window 238 also provides progress feedback and context information to the user by highlighting the current outline segment and may be visible by default. Alternatively, a visual icon 239 may be utilized to indicate the current segment" and in paragraph 114 on page 114, "Double and single clicking the pointer may also be used to cause the pointer to disappear and reappear, respectively, on the display 238 in the same manner").

Claim 19

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format pertains to a text box associated with the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarch then the sum of the times of it children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window..."; the outline window is the text display area or text box).

Claim 20

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, but Fullerton does not specifically teach **wherein the user configured format pertains to a user defined text to display when an image cannot be displayed**. However, the above limitation was well known in the art, as shown by Microsoft (in figure 12). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Fullerton to include this formatting of Microsoft for the purpose of providing viewers with supplementary information when pictures are loading or missing.

Claim 21

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **the intelligent agenda comprises a timer displaying the approximate duration of each slide** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]").

Claims 22-26 and 29-42

Claims 22-26 and 29-42 are the program product claims corresponding to the method claims 1-5 and 8-21 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-21.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

#### Claims 43 and 46-56

Claims 43 and 46-56 are the apparatus claims corresponding to the method claims 1-5 and 8-21, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-21.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "Computer system 100 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor"), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For



Art Unit: 2178

example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...").

3. Claims 6, 27, and 44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1), Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000) in view of Lee et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0218639 A1).

#### Claim 6

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton further teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach **wherein the outline expansion option is to expand all levels of the outline**. However, Lee teaches the above limitation (e.g. in figure 5 and in paragraph 28 on page 3, "As seen by the highlighted background, the user selects the "Expand all" option 510, selecting automatic expansion of the tree. This feature of the invention expands the tree in its entirety"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the expansion option of Lee because it would allow the user to quickly and easily expand the outline for viewing, without having to individually expand the nodes.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 27

Claim 27 is the program product claim corresponding to the method claim 6, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

Claims 44

The rejection of claim 43 is incorporated, and claim 44 is the apparatus claim corresponding to the method claim 6, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "Computer system 100

Art Unit: 2178

includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor”), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, “User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...”).

4. Claims 7, 28, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1), Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000) in view of Good et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0138570 A1).

#### Claim 7

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton further teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach **wherein the outline expansion option is to expand a user-configurable number of levels of the outline**. However, Good teaches the above limitation (e.g. in item 30 of figure 1 in view of paragraph 18 on page 2, “The menu 30 consists of entries to close ancestors of the selected node 20’, the selected node 20’, and options to individually open the

Art Unit: 2178

nodes at each level of the hierarchy 40 below the selected node 20'. Each descendent level indicates the number of nodes that would be shown below the selected level 20', should the hierarchy 40 be opened to that level"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the expansion option of Good because it would allow the user to quickly and easily expand the outline for viewing, without having to individually expand the nodes (e.g. in paragraph 18 on page 2, "The multilevel expand/collapse navigation aid thus saves the user from having either to expand the structure 40 by manually expanding multiple individual nodes 20 within that structure").

#### Claim 28

Claim 28 is the program product claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

Claims 45

The rejection of claim 43 is incorporated, and claim 45 is the apparatus claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "Computer system 100 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor"), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...").

***Appendix***

5. Brief description of the figures in Microsoft Powerpoint 2000 guide:

Fig. 1: About screen

Fig. 2: Opening screen

Fig. 3: After clicking on "OK"

Fig. 4: After clicking on a layout item

Fig. 5: After clicking on "OK"

Fig. 6: After clicking on an element of the presentation

Fig. 7: After clicking on "Format" and highlighting "Colors and Lines..."

Fig. 8: After clicking on "Colors and Lines..." and then selecting a drop  
down

menu (to change line properties)

Fig. 9: After selecting a black line

Fig. 10: After selecting drop down menu to change line style

Fig. 11: After choosing line style

Fig. 12: After selecting "Web" tab (to show other properties of element that  
can

be configured)

Fig. 13: After clicking "OK"

Fig. 14: After deselecting element (to more clearly see the newly  
configured

element with the designated line properties)

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 02/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The following are the substantial arguments in the remarks. However, examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant argues that Dieberger does not teach "an outline in a corner" and "a vertical strip" precludes Dieberger's slide map from being "in a corner". However, paragraph 27 in conjunction with figure 6 shows an example of an object "in a corner" for the lower left and right corners. Therefore, by comparison, figure 1 clearly shows the vertical strip of the slide map "in a corner", more specifically the upper left corner, of the slide. The slide map being "a vertical strip" is unrelated to "in a corner". Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, it is noted that the outlines shown in applicant's drawings are also "vertical strips displayed on the far left side".

Applicant argues that Fullerton does not teach "the outline displays a contextual location of a current slide in a presentation" because Fullerton's feedback and context information is relative to the current position of Fullerton's movie rather than Fullerton's slides. However, the limitation does not preclude Fullerton's the outline from displaying context information relative to the current position of the movie or presentation. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The slide displayed depends on the position in the presentation. As can be seen in figure 6, the outline of Fullerton displays a contextual location of the current slide

Art Unit: 2178

in the presentation, as the slide displayed also corresponds to the position of the arrow. Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). For example, Yacovone is disclosed to teach the outline created by extracting the titles of each of the slides in the presentation.

Applicant argues that Fullerton fails to teach responsive to the determination that the user has not configured a display option, displaying the outline with all the topics in the outline expanded. However, figure 6 shows the system of Fullerton presented to the user, wherein all the topics are expanded (display option not configured). The user can then collapse and expand the twiddles to display the outline according to the user's needs (to cause a change of display option).

Applicant argues that merely resizing a window does not allow the user to specify the number of lines required in an outline. However, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In view of figure 6, changing the size of the box clearly allows the user to display more, less, or keep the same number of lines of the outline. Any change in the size of the box would require a determination of whether a change was made and if so, what less or more to display.



Applicant argues that Fullerton does not allow the user to limit the types of topics displayed in the outline because it merely teaches collapsing and expanding the outline. However, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In view of figure 6, the user is able to expand or collapse, for example, the "Key Features" type of topics, which include topics "The Feature List" and "Intuitive". Therefore, the user is able to limit "types of topics".

As such, the rejections stand.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM WONG whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2178

/William Wong/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2178